

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
ORANGEBURG DIVISION

Nathan Carl Reed, #32089-045,

Petitioner,

vs.

Warden of FCI Williamsburg,

Respondent.

Civil Action No. 5:22-868-CMC

ORDER

This matter is before the court on Petitioner's *pro se* petition for writ of habeas corpus filed in this court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241. ECF No. 1.

In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Civil Rule 73.02 (B)(2)(c), DSC, this matter was referred to United States Magistrate Judge Kaymani D. West for pre-trial proceedings and a Report and Recommendation ("Report"). On April 7, 2022, the Magistrate Judge issued a Report recommending that the petition for habeas corpus be dismissed without prejudice and without requiring Respondent to file a return. ECF No. 16. The Magistrate Judge advised Petitioner of the procedures and requirements for filing objections to the Report and the serious consequences if he failed to do so. The court has received no objections and the time for filing such has expired.¹

¹ When this action arose, Petitioner was housed at FCI Williamsburg and the Report was mailed to Petitioner at that institution. However, the mail was returned as undeliverable. ECF No. 21. The Clerk searched the BOP inmate locator and determined Petitioner was housed at FTC Oklahoma City on April 22, 2022, and an additional copy of the Report was mailed to Petitioner at that location and his time to respond extended. The extended time to respond has expired, and Petitioner's copy of the Report mailed to Oklahoma City has not been returned to the court.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with the court. *See Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261 (1976). The court is charged with making a *de novo* determination of any portion of the Report of the Magistrate Judge to which a specific objection is made. The court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation made by the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b). The court reviews the Report only for clear error in the absence of an objection. *See Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (stating that “in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a *de novo* review, but instead must only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.”) (citation omitted).

After reviewing the record of this matter, the applicable law, and the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, the court agrees with the conclusions of the Magistrate Judge. Accordingly, the court adopts and incorporates the Report and Recommendation by reference in this Order and this petition is dismissed without prejudice.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Cameron McGowan Currie
CAMERON MCGOWAN CURRIE
Senior United States District Judge

Columbia, South Carolina
May 17, 2022